



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,730	12/04/2003	Daniel J. Daily	4366-149	1751

48500 7590 12/31/2007
SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.
1560 BROADWAY, SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/31/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/728,730

Applicant(s)

DAILY ET AL.

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on October 04, 2007. Claims 1– 31 were previously presented. No new claims were added. Claims 1 – 31 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's remarks filed on 10/04/2007 have been fully considered.

Applicant merely lists amended claim limitations and states that the pending claims are not obvious over the independent claim 1 of the 6,374,261 patent. Examiner disagrees and directs Applicant's attention for the details of double patenting rejection, see below. Examiner maintains double patenting rejection and further requests Applicants attention to Patent 6,374,261 Column 5 line 44 – Column 10 line 50 for description of patent claim limitations.

Applicant argues that Claim 8 requires "performing at least of on" substeps (i) and (ii) and Claim 9 and 10 each claim subset (i) and (ii) respectfully. By Applicants own admission, Claim 8 requires substep (i) OR substep (ii), but not both. Examiner agrees that Claim 8 requires one of substep (i) or (ii) and further explains that if substep (ii) were to carried out according Claim 8, then Claim 9 does not further limits Claim 8, as parsing method will not be able to execute subset (i) of Claim 8 and thus Claims 9 and 14 (dependent on Claim 9) will not takes place. The same arguments hold if substep (i) were to take place, wherein Claim 10 and Claims 12 – 13 will not be executed. Examiner maintains Claims objection and requests amending claims 9 and 10.

Applicant agrees that Johnson (U.S. Publication 2002/141449) discloses a method for parsing a bit stream including multiple data formats, a set of parsers and parser-selection and invocation capabilities for handling parsing of multiple data formats. However, Applicant argues the newly introduced claim limitations are not disclosed. These arguments are not persuasive.

Examiner respectfully asserts that the cited prior art (see details of rejection below), does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in amended independent claims. The dependent claims are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on the dependent claims and by other reason set forth in this office action.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1 – 31 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,261. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant case, all elements of claims 1 – 31 correspond to the claims of 1 – 11 of the patent claims, except in the instant claims the elements "a plurality of parsers operable to parse an input stream, each parser corresponding to a unique input structure; and a parser selection agent operable to receive the input stream, wherein the input stream comprises a plurality of

differing input structures and wherein the selected subset of parsers produce multiple parser outputs corresponding to the plurality of differing input structures” and “an encoding agent operable to convert the multiple outputs to a common grammar”, are referred in the patent claims as “analyzing the information of the identified types by executing an intelligent filter that uses heuristics to identify therein items of information for storage in the knowledge database; a plurality of predefined types of information ..”, “checking an identified item of information for consistency between a plurality of identified types of information”, “parsing the information of a said identified type by executing said intelligent filter that uses keyword-based or phase-based heuristics”. Further more, the instant claim limitation “a plurality of parsers operable to parse an input stream, each parser corresponding to a unique input structure” is referred to patent claim limitations “the subject comprises a plurality of targets of the expert system, determining from an extracted item which ones of the plurality of targets the file pertains to; creating a separate database record for each of the ones of the plurality of the targets and storing each of the created database records in the knowledge database”. Thus the patent claims encompass amended instant claim limitations.

Claims of the instant application are anticipated by patent claims in that the patent claims contains all the limitations of the instant application. Claims of the instant application therefore is not patentably distinct from the earlier patent claims and as such are unpatentable for obvious-type double patenting (*In re Goodman (CAFC) 29 USPQ2d 2010 (12/3/1993)*).

Claim Objections

4. Claims 9 and 10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or

rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 8 step d recites "performing at least one of (i) and (ii)". Claim 9 does not further limit claim 8 as substep d(i) is performed is already recited in claim 8 and Claim 10 does not further limit claim 8 as substep d(ii) is performed is already recited in claim 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 12, 23 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 12 and 23 recite "wherein the input stream is free of embedded tag indicating a source and/or input structure associated with the input stream ..." and "wherein each of a plurality of differently structured segments of the stream is free of an embedded tag indicating a corresponding computational source and/or input structure for the respective segment". Instant specification does not disclose such embedded tag and Applicant's remark does not provide any details as to where in the specification such support can be found.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 26 recites "wherein a parser performing the steps of Claim 20 is not provided by another computational entity...". Claim 23 does not provide any computational entity for Claim 26 to further narrow Claim 23 with another computational entity. Examiner requests amending the claim to clearly recite the subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson (U.S. Publication Number 2002/0141449).

7. As per Claim 1, Johnson teaches "a plurality of parsers operable to parse an input stream, each parser corresponding to a unique input structure;

a parser selection agent operable to receive the input stream and select a subset of the plurality of parsers to parse the input stream, wherein the input stream comprises a plurality of differing input structures and wherein the selected subset of parsers produce multiple parser outputs corresponding to the plurality of differing input structures; and

an encoding agent operable to convert the multiple parser outputs to a common grammar (Summary and Paragraph [0037 – 0044])".

8. As per Claim 8, Johnson teaches " (a) receiving an input stream, the input stream comprising information defined by at least first and second input structures; (b) providing at least a portion of the input stream to each of a plurality of parsers, the plurality of parsers

corresponding to differing sets of grammars; (c) receiving output from each of plurality of parsers (Summary and Paragraph [0037 – 0044]); and

(d) based on the outputs of the plurality of parsers, performing at least one of: (i) selecting a firstOutput from a first parser that corresponds to the first input structure and a second output from a second parser that corresponds to the second input structure; and (ii) selecting a first parser corresponding to the first input structure to parse one or more first segments of the input stream and a second parser corresponding to the second input structure to parse one or more second segments of the input stream (paragraph [0044, 0047 – 0050 and 0120])”.

9. As per Claim 23, Johnson teaches “receiving a stream of information, the stream being generated by one of a plurality of possible different computational sources, wherein each computational source generates a stream corresponding to a unique input structure and wherein each of a plurality of differently structured segments of the stream is free of an embedded tag indicating a corresponding computational source and/or input structure for the respective segment; comparing at least a portion of the stream with a set of tokens to provide a subset of tokens identified in the at least a portion of the stream (Summary and Paragraph [0037 – 0044]),

heuristically identifying, from among at least one of a plurality of possible input structures and a plurality of possible computational sources, at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0044, 0047 – 0050 and [0120]), and

parsing the stream based on the identified at least one of an input structure and computational source (paragraph [0047 – 0050 and 0120])”.

10. As per Claim 28, Johnson teaches "an input operable to receive a stream of information, the stream being generated by one of a plurality of possible different computational sources, wherein each computational source generates a stream corresponding to a unique input structure, and a parser operable to (a) compare at least a portion of the stream with a set of tokens to provide a subset of tokens identified in the at least a portion of the stream (Summary and Paragraph [0037 – 0044]);

(b)heuristically identify, from among at least one of a plurality of possible input structures and a plurality of possible computational sources, at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0044, 0047 – 0050 and [0120]); and

(c) parse the stream based on the identified at least one of an input structure and computational source, wherein the parser is not provided with an input structure identifier, other than the corresponding input structure itself, either in or external to the at least a portion of the input stream to identify or assist in the identification of the at least one of the respective input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0047 – 0050 and 0120])).

11. As per Claim 2, Johnson teaches "wherein the multiple parser outputs correspond to differing grammars (Paragraph [0049])".

12. As per Claim 3, Johnson teaches "wherein the parser selection agent and plurality of parsers are configured in a factory pattern and wherein the input stream comprises a plurality of messages having a plurality of headers comprising differing types of information (Paragraph [0049])".

13. As per Claim 4, Johnson teaches, “wherein the parser selection agent is operable to provide to a client, in response to a parse request, at least one of a parser output and an indication when at least some of the input stream is not successfully parsed and wherein the parser selection agent, prior to selection of the subset of parsers, is not informed in advance of the source or input structure associated with the at least some of the input stream (Paragraph [0049 – 0051])”.

14. As per Claim 5, Johnson teaches “wherein the parser selection agent is operable to provide to a client, in response to a parse request, an error message when the parser selection agent is unable to identify one of the plurality of parsers to parse at least some of the input stream and when the parser selection agent is able to identify more than one of the plurality of parsers to parse at least some of the input stream (Paragraph [0049 – 0051])”.

15. As per Claim 6, Johnson teaches “wherein the input stream comprises fault information, the fault information being related to at least one of an alarm and an error, the fault information comprising first fault information related to a first event and in a first format and second fault information related to a second event discrete from the first event and in a second format different from the first format and wherein the encoding agent is operable to convert the first and second formats to a common format (Paragraph [0049 – 0051])”.

16. As per Claim 9, Johnson teaches “wherein substep d(i) is performed (Paragraph [0049])”.

17. As per Claim 10, Johnson teaches “wherein substep d(ii) is performed (Paragraph [0049])”.

18. As per Claim 11, Johnson teaches “wherein the input stream comprises a plurality of nonstandardized headers (Paragraph [0049])”.

19. As per Claim 12, Johnson teaches "identifying one or more tokens in the input stream; and based on the identified one or more tokens, selecting the at least one of a plurality of parsers (Paragraph [0044])".

20. As per Claim 13, Johnson teaches "determining for each of the at least one of a plurality of parsers whether a match or a no match condition exists, a match condition indicating that a selected parser has successfully parser a selected segment of the input stream and a no match condition indicating that the selected parser has not successfully parsed the selected segment of the input stream; and applying the following rules: when, for a parsed segment, only one match condition is found to exist, not generating an error message; when, for a parsed segment, a match condition is not found to exist, generating an error message; and when, for a parsed segment, multiple match conditions are found to exist, generating an error message (Paragraph [0045])".

21. As per Claim 16, Johnson teaches "wherein the first parser produces a first output and the first output is a parse tree and further comprising: recursively evaluating at least some of the nodes in the parse tree to identify nodes requiting additional parsing (Paragraph [0044 – 0045])".

22. As per Claim 17, Johnson teaches "wherein the first parser produces a first output and the first output is a parse tree and further comprising: recursively examining at least some of the nodes in the parse tree to identify nodes of interest to a client (Paragraph [0049 – 0051])".

23. As per Claim 18, Johnson teaches "wherein the first parser produces a first output and the first output is a parse tree and wherein at least first and second nodes of the parse tree have differing formats and further comprising: iteratively traversing a plurality of the nodes of the parse tree to locate nodes of interest, the nodes of interest comprising the first and second

nodes; and converting each of the located nodes of interest to a standard format (Paragraph [0044 – 0051])”.

24. As per Claim 20, Johnson teaches “wherein each of the plurality of parsers corresponds to a unique set of tokens and grammar rules (Paragraph [0049])”.

25. As per Claim 21, Johnson teaches “wherein each of the plurality of parsers corresponds to a unique set of attribute grammars (Paragraph [0049])”.

26. As per Claim 22, Johnson teaches “A computer readable medium containing processor executable instructions to perform the steps of Claim 8 (Paragraph [0049])”.

27. As per Claim 24, Johnson teaches “wherein in the input stream comprises a plurality of headers, wherein the headers comprise differing types of information, wherein each of the tokens has a corresponding method expressing a set of syntactical and/or semantical relationships relating to the respective token and wherein the heuristically identifying step comprises: for each token in the subset of tokens, invoking a corresponding method (paragraph [0044, 0047 – 0050 and [0120])”.

28. As per Claim 26, Johnson teaches “herein a parser performing the steps of Claim 20 is not provided, by another computational entity, with a flag external to the input stream to identify or assist in the identification of the at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0044, 0047 – 0050 and [0120])”.

29. As per Claim 27, Johnson teaches “A computer readable medium containing processor executable instructions to perform the steps of Claim 23 (paragraph [0044])”.

30. As per Claim 29, Johnson teaches “wherein each of the tokens has a corresponding parser expressing a set of syntactical and/or semantical relationships relating to the respective token and wherein the parser is further operable, for each token in the subset of tokens, to (d) to invoke a corresponding method (paragraph [0044, 0047 – 0050 and [0120]]”).

31. As per Claim 31, Johnson teaches “wherein the parser is not provided, by another computational component, with a flag external to the input stream to identify or assist in the identification of the at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0044 and [0120]])”.

32. As per Claim 7, Johnson teaches “wherein the first and second fault information uses different characters to refer to a same type of event and the encoding agent is further operable to convert the different characters to a common set of characters to refer to the event (paragraph [0047 – 0050])”.

33. As per Claim 14, Johnson teaches “wherein a third parser successfully parses a first portion of the input stream to form a third output and the first parser successfully parses the first portion of the input stream to form a first output and further comprising:
determining which of the first and third outputs most likely corresponds to the first portion (paragraph [0044, 0047 – 0050])”.

34. As per Claim 19, Johnson teaches “wherein each of the first and second nodes use different characters to refer to a same type of event and further comprising:
converting the characters in the first and second nodes to a common set of characters to refer to the type of event (paragraph [0047 – 0050])”.

35. As per Claim 25, Johnson teaches "wherein the comparing and heuristically identifying steps are performed using a declarative programming approach rather than a procedural programming approach, wherein the headers are nonstandardized, and wherein the invoking step comprises setting a set of flags a corresponding set of values depending on the presence or absence of a syntactical and/or semantical relationship; and wherein the values of the flags are used to heuristically identify the at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0044, 0047 – 0050 and [0120]]".

36. As per Claim 30, Johnson teaches "wherein the parser is further operable to (e) assign, by an invoked method, a set of flags a corresponding set of values depending on the presence or absence of a syntactical and/or semantical relationship, wherein the values of the flags are used to heuristically identify the at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0044, 0047 – 0050 and [0120]]".

37. As per Claim 15, Johnson teaches, "wherein the determining step is performed using a least squares fit analysis and wherein step (d) is performed using a declarative programming rather than procedural programming approach(paragraph [0047 – 0050])".

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m..

Application/Control Number:
10/728,730
Art Unit: 2136

Page 14

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-232-4195. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Pramila Parthasarathy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2136
December 25, 2007.